

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 03 2006

Ser. No. 09/870,878

6

10003568-1

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the careful review of the application as set forth in the outstanding office action. Reconsideration of the application in view of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

It is noted that Claim 9 is amended to insert the word ~~said~~. This corrects a error in the paper filed April 26th, in which the word was to be underscored, but instead was stricken out. The amendment herein conforms Claim 9 to the same amendment as made to Claim 19 in the April 26th paper. Applicant respectfully requests that this amendment be entered as improving the form of Claim 9, and placing the claims in better condition for appeal.

The pending claims stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Ohsumi et al. ("Ohsumi") in view of Kato, either taken together without other applied references or variously in combination with Mizubata et al. ("Mizubata") or Wibbels et al. ("Wibbels"). These grounds for rejection have been addressed in applicant's response paper filed April 26th, and applicant refers to the April 26th paper for reasons as to why the rejection does not present a prima facie case of obviousness and the applied references do not teach or suggest the claimed subject matter.

It is noted that the grounds of the rejection set out in the August 2nd office action do not take into account the amended claimed subject matter. For example, at paragraph 10, page 5 of the office action, third and fourth line, in discussing Claim 1, the Examiner alleges that Ohsumi discloses "... determining actual medium size and/or medium placement characteristics ...; using size and/or placement characteristics..." Claim 1 as amended recites "actual medium size and medium placement characteristics" and so the rejection does not meet the claimed subject matter.

Ser. No. 09/870,878

7

10003568-1

Turning now to the Examiner's holdings set out in paragraph 4 of the office action, the Examiner asserts that:

...examiner Rahimi correctly asserts that Kato discloses that information relating to the length of the sheet is detected in col 5, lines 61-67 and col 6, lines 1-12. Kato discloses, "The CPU determines the timing of the stop or the reversal of the large-diameter roller 25 according to the detection signal from the sheet detection means 27a or 27b and information relating to the length of the sheet in the conveying directions input from an operation unit (not shown)." The examiner interprets this to be equivalent to determining medium size pertaining to the actual medium length of the sheet along the media feed path (seen in Fig 2 of Kato). The examiner further interprets the CPU to determine the actual length of the medium by means of the user input. For example, if the user, supplying the user input to the CPU, determines the actual length to be 11 inches (along the direction of the media feed path) in a 8.5x11 inch piece of printing paper or medium, the CPU then determines the actual length from the user input. Therefore, the examiner interprets the reference to correctly read on the claimed features.

The applicant respectfully submits that the foregoing discussion of Ohsumi in view of Kato clearly demonstrates why the references fail to teach or suggest the claimed subject matter. The Examiner has posited two alternative rationales as to how the combination allegedly describes the claimed subject matter. These are considered below.

Kato's sheet detection means 27a and 27b are used to detect the leading edge of the sheet S, and the CPU stops the large diameter roller 25 at a position before the trailing edge of the sheet reaches the duplex reversal unit UA or in duplex copying, before the trailing edge reaches the driven roller 26b. The CPU determines the stoppage of the roller 25 according to the leading edge detection

Ser. No. 09/870,878

8

10003568-1

signal and information relating to the length of the sheet in the conveying direction input from an operation unit. Thus, Kato clearly does not detect an actual length of the sheet in the conveying direction because he does not detect the trailing edge of the sheet after detecting the leading edge. Instead Kato relies on information "relating to the length" input from an operation unit. This inputted information can only be interpreted as a nominal length dimension, e.g., as the Examiner posits, an 11 inch length for letter size paper. Yet the actual dimension of the sheet may vary from the nominal dimension, as noted in applicant's specification, e.g. at 4:21-28. Kato does not address the problem associated with variation from the nominal dimension. Thus, the Examiner's assertion ("The examiner interprets this to be equivalent to determining medium size pertaining to the actual medium length of the sheet along the media feed path") is without support in the applied references.

Now consider the second line of reasoning asserted by the Examiner ("The examiner further interprets the CPU to determine the actual length of the medium by means of the user input"). As pointed out above, however, at most the user input can only suggest entry of a nominal dimension, say 11 Inches. This is not the actual length of the sheet, which may vary from the nominal dimension due to various reasons. For example, there are cutting tolerances and size variations based on moisture content (driven by relative humidity) that impact the actual size of the medium. Thus, the combination of Ohsumi and Kato does not teach or suggest the claimed subject matter, for reasons given above and in the paper filed April 26th.

Applicant further traverses the holdings set out in paragraphs 5 and 6, for reasons set out in the paper filed April 26th.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 03 2006

Ser. No. 09/870,878


9

10003568-1

CONCLUSION

The outstanding rejections have been addressed, and the application is in condition for allowance. Such favorable reconsideration is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Larry K. Roberts
Registration No. 28,464

Dated: 10.3.2006

Law Offices of Larry K. Roberts, Inc.
P.O. Box 8569
Newport Beach, CA 92658-8569
Telephone (949) 250-6008
Facsimile (949) 250-6012